

NOV. 16. 2006 7:09PM

HOWREY SIMON ARNOLD & WHITE, LLP

NO. 2422 P. 3



RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

NOV 16 2006

Serial No.: 10/512,110  
Confirmation No.: 8486  
Applicant: David J. Thomson  
Atty. Ref.: 11134.0010.PCUS00

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:**

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 1. This sheet replaces the original sheet Fig. 1. Drawing sheets Figs. 2 through 5 are also provided as originally submitted.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet Fig. 1

Figs. 2-5



Serial No.: 10/512,110

Confirmation No.: 8486

Applicant: David J. Thomson

Atty. Ref.: 11134.0010.PCUS00

**REMARKS:****DRAWINGS:**

Applicant submits replacement Figure 1 and has re-submitted original Figures 2-5. These Figures are believe to be in accordance with 37 CFR 1.121(d). Applicant has further labeled Figure 1 as "Prior Art". Accordingly, Applicant believes that the Examiner's objections to the drawings have been overcome.

**SPECIFICATION:**

Applicant has amended the abstract in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion and amended the specification in order to correct the informalities pointed out by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicant believes that these objections have been overcome.

**CLAIMS:**

Applicant has canceled claims 1-10 and has presented new claims 11-17. No new matter has been added by virtue of these amendments. Support for the above amendments is found in Applicant's specification and in at least the following: new independent claim 11 finds support in original claims 1 to 5; claim 13 finds support in original claim 10, and claims 15 to 17 find support in at last poaragraphs [0027] to [0029].

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102:**

The Examiner has rejected original claims 1-4 and 6-9 as being anticipated by Rosin (U.S. Patent No. 4,989,311) and by Johnson (U.S. Paent No. 4,908,925).

Applicant has canceled original claims 1-10 and have submitted new claims 11-17. Applicant believes that these claims are patentable over Rosin and Johnson. In particular, Claim 11 defines a support adaptor assembly for a bearing press, which has an elongate rectangular shape plate that has a centrally located clear hole through which a pressing shaft of a bearing press can extend; that is a hole with smooth side walls. In the cited documents, the centrally mounted threaded shaft (see reference numeral 19 in *Rosin*, and reference numeral 38 in *Johnson*) engages corresponding internal threads in the hole of the plate. The centrally located



Serial No.: 10/512,110  
Confirmation No.: 8486  
Applicant: David J. Thomson  
Atty. Ref.: 11134.0010.PCUS00

clear hole in the present invention does not engage the pressing shaft of the bearing press. This allows the support adaptor assembly of the present invention to be used with bearing presses of different configuration, such as hydraulic bearing presses, in which a hydraulic ram provides the axial force to the pressing shaft, and also conventional bearing presses that use a threaded pressing shaft, which is screwed to provide the requisite axial force. The clear hole allows free relative rotation between the header plate and the bearing press, including the pressing shaft. Thus, the entire support adaptor assembly, including an object attached to the support rods, can be rotated relative to the pressing shaft without affecting the axial force provided by the pressing shaft.

In the arrangements disclosed in *Rosin* and *Johnson* any attempt to rotate the header plate relative to the centrally located shaft would result in the axial force of the respective shaft being either increased or decreased. Thus, the support adapter assembly can be considered to be a free floating unit. In contrast, the arrangement disclosed in *Rosin* and *Johnson* are not able to rotate once an axial force has been applied through the pressing shaft. Accordingly, the arrangements in *Rosin* and *Johnson* become locked in position. Applicant also submits that none of the cited documents disclose a centrally located clear hole through which a pressing shaft can extend. Furthermore, neither *Rosin* nor *Johnson* disclose a stirrup shaped adaptor attached to an end of each support rod for connecting an object to the support rods.

Accordingly, Applicant believes that claims 11-17 are patentable over either *Rosin* or *Johnson*.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103:**

The Examiner has rejected original claims 5 and 10 as being unpatentable over *Johnson* in view of *Lee* (U.S. Patent No. 2,677,174).

Applicant has canceled original claims 1-10 and have submitted new claims 11-17. Applicant further believes that these claims are patentable over *Johnson* in view of *Lee* as *Johnson* neither discloses nor suggests a support adaptor assembly for a bearing press. *Johnson* relates to a tool for pulling a bearing from within a hub. Applicant submits that, in this art, tools for pulling bearings from within a hub are considered distinct and unrelated to tools for pushing



Serial No.: 10/512,110

Confirmation No.: 8486

Applicant: David J. Thomson

Atty. Ref.: 11134.0010.PCUS00

bearings into a hub. As *Johnson* relates to tools for pulling a component from within an object. We submit that these documents are unrelated to the present invention.

With respect to *Lee*, *Lee* relates to a device for pulling blast furnace bosh plates, whereas *Johnson* relates to a heavy duty automotive wheel hub puller. We submit that *Lee* and *Johnson* are in distinctly different arts, and accordingly the skilled artisan is not the same. We submit that even if a person skilled in the present art was to look to the disclosure in *Johnson* they would not be motivated to combine the disclosure in *Lee* in the manner suggested by the Examiner to arrive at the present invention. Not only would a skilled artisan consider the disclosure in *Johnson* to be irrelevant to the present invention, they would also consider the disclosure in *Lee* to be unrelated. We submit that this skilled artisan would also not be motivated to combine the disclosure in any of the cited documents with the disclosure in *Lee* to arrive at the present invention.

The Applicant has considered the rejections and objections raised by the Examiner as well as the prior art and, for the reasons set out hereunder, the Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in fact patentably distinguishable over the prior art.

\*\*\*\*\*

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone to discuss any issues or questions presented by this paper or otherwise remaining in the application.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'Michelle C. Replogle', written over the printed name.

Michelle C. Replogle

Patent Attorney

Reg. No. 54,394

Tel. 713.787.1535

Date:

11/16/04